

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 24, 29-32, 33 and 38-48 are allowed. Applicant's attorney also wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the in-person interview of October 13, 2004.

Remaining claims 49, 50 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,559,525 (Zenda).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration as the office action appears to overlook specific claim language for example in claim 49. Claim 49 includes, among other things, a plurality of display controllers each retrieving display data from the screen memory portion and "simultaneously providing display data" to at least one display associated with the screen memory portion. This simultaneously providing of the display data to at least one display, has not been addressed in the office action and does not appear to be taught in the cited reference. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance.

In addition, the Zenda reference does not appear to teach or suggest any simultaneous output from multiple display controllers to a common display or multiple displays. To the contrary, the Zenda reference explicitly states that is directed to a system capable of displaying an image on either one or another of a CRT or plasma display apparatus -- but not both -- and the display controllers do not simultaneously provide display data for a common CRT as it appears only one display controller as used at any given time. For example, the LCD controller or display controller 109 each operate one at any given time depending upon the type of single display connected to the system. Applicant also respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks from the previous response with respect to the Zenda reference. As noted therein, the Zenda reference

teaches that the CRT controller selectively (one or the other) drives the CRT or PDP display as based on a display timing signal generating parameters. As a result, the reference states that when one of the displays is chosen, and the other is not, a register is used in accordance with the timing control to control a single controller for a given display device. In addition, the alternative configurations in Zenda also appear to be capable of driving only one of a CRT or a PDP at any time. Applicant respectfully believes that, for example, column 7, lines 59-64 for example explicitly make clear that only one of a CRT or a PDP can be selected, and not both. As such, claim 49 is believed to be in condition for allowance.


As to new claim 56, this claim is also believed to be allowable since the Examiner has allowed claims with a similar limitation that in combination is not taught or suggested by the references and accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance.

Claims 51 and 52 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being obvious in view of Zenda and Ranganathan. Applicant respectfully reasserts the remarks made above with respect to Zenda and as such the claims are in condition for allowance. The dependent claims also add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 25, 2005

By: 
Christopher J. Reckamp
Reg. No. 34,414

VEDDER, PRICE, KAUFMAN &
KAMMHOLZ, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7500
FAX: (312) 609-5005